DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 373 IR 054 921

AUTHOR Damko, Ellen E.
TITLE Student Attitudes toward Bibliographic Instruction.
PUB DATE Dec 90
NOTE 46p.; M.L.S. Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; *College Students; Higher Education; Information Literacy; Interviews; Librarians; *Library Instruction; Library Services; Library Skills; Questionnaires; Research Skills; *Student Attitudes; Tables (Data); *Users (Information)
IDENTIFIERS Ohio

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to determine what value, if any, college students place upon library use instruction. A survey conducted on a random sample of college and university students working at Cedar Point Amusement Park in Sandusky, Ohio, during the summer of 1990 was designed to determine the type and amount of library instruction each student has received and if he or she found or would find it beneficial. The significance of a student's field of study and the size of the library used were considered in relationship to his or her attitude. To supplement the survey, interviews were conducted to gather more detailed information about what students know about certain library resources and what skills they possess. The findings of this survey may assist librarians who are responsible for planning bibliographic instruction programs in demonstrating the practicality of the material and perhaps stimulating interest in the topic. Included in the appendices are the questionnaire; the interview schedule; and a tally sheet showing number of respondents for each item. (Contains 10 references.) (JLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 367 373

STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

Ellen E. Damko

December, 1990

1205421

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Rosemary Du Mont

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

This study is designed to determine what value, if any, college students place upon library use instruction. A survey conducted on a purposive random sample of college and university students working at Cedar Point Amusement Park in Sandusky, Ohio during the summer of 1990 was designed to determine the type and amount of library instruction each student has received, and if s/he found, or would find it beneficial. The significance of a student's field of study, and the size of the library which s/he uses was considered in relation to his/her attitude. To supplement the survey, interviews were conducted to gather more detailed information about what students know about certain library resources, and what skills they possess.

Master's Research Paper by

Ellen E. Damko

B.A., Ohio State University, 1989

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1990

Approved by

Adviser Lois Buttlar Date 11-2-90

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES iv

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. LITERATURE REVIEW 5

3. METHODOLOGY 15

4. ANALYSIS OF DATA 17

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION 27

Appendix

A QUESTIONNAIRE 32

STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION

B INTERVIEW SCHEDULE 34

C TALLY SHEET SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS FOR EACH ITEM 36

NOTES 38

BIBLIOGRAPHY 40

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Subjects by Type of Library	18
2.	Subjects by Academic Major	18
3.	Methods of Library Research Ranked by Mean Score	20
4.	Where or How Students Acquired Library Skills	20
5.	Student Opinions about Whether Library Use in Freshman Orientation	21
6.	Students' Reasons for Taking a Course in Library Use Ranked by Mean Score	23
7.	Collapsed Data for Questionnaire Items 3-15	26

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Today, librarians are spending more and more time planning and conducting bibliographic instruction courses and programs. The abundance and increasing complexity of library resources has made this type of instruction requisite for college students doing research. Students are now faced with many options for obtaining information: online data bases, CD-ROMs, microforms, and conventional print sources. Therefore, there is enough material to warrant intense bibliographic instruction at the college level.

Purpose of the Study

Many methods of doing bibliographic instruction have been presented in the literature. However, an effective way of communicating the importance of the library and how to make effective use of it has not yet been discovered. The aim of this study is to find out how students feel about library use courses (bibliographic instruction): whether or not they feel it is profitable and why or why not. The

findings of this survey may assist librarians who are responsible for planning bibliographic instruction programs in demonstrating the practicality of the material, and perhaps stimulating interest in the topic.

Definition of Terms

Arts & Science major-A student studying any general subject relating to the arts and sciences including the following examples: chemistry, english, psychology, social work, french, political science, etc.

Bibliographic instruction-Another term for **Library Use Instruction**.

Business major-A student studying any subject relating to business: accounting, marketing, finance, international business, etc.

Cedar Point Amusement Park-A seasonally operated amusement park located in Sandusky, Ohio which employs approximately 3,200 college students during the months May through September.

Education major-A student studying education of any type including the following examples: business, elementary, special, and physical education.

Fine Arts major-A student studying any of the fine arts: visual arts, music, theatre, etc. Interior design and fashion design are also included in this category.

Graduate student-A student who has completed at least four years of college, received a Bachelor's Degree, and is presently enrolled in a graduate program leading to an advanced degree.

Health & Allied Health major-A student studying a subject relating to physical or mental health with a stated intention of practicing as a health care professional (e.g., a student majoring in psychology without stating that s/he plans to become a psychologist is classified in the Arts & Sciences category). Some examples are as follows: nursing, pre-med, and physical and occupational therapy.

Large-sized library-A library which, according to the 1989 American Library Directory, owns one million or more volumes.

Medium-sized library-A library which, according to the 1989 American Library Directory, owns between one hundred thousand and 999,999 volumes.

Science & Technology major-A student studying a field which focuses on a very specific topic in science (e.g., water science), any type of engineering (e.g., geological or mechanical engineering), or vocational sciences (e.g., police science).

Small-sized library-A library which, according to the 1989

American Library Directory, owns up to 99,999 volumes.

Undergraduate student-A college student whose official class rank is freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior.

Limitations

The survey was conducted in one geographical location, Cedar Point, but the subjects are predominantly from colleges and universities in Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and Pennsylvania.

Although the subjects represent a variety of academic institutions and diverse subject interests, they do have one thing in common: virtually all of them took the summer off from school. That is, at the time each student completed a questionnaire s/he was not technically "a student."

Students work at Cedar Point for reasons other than just to earn money. The park is part of a summer resort, and students are attracted by the active social life it offers. This factor gives some insight as to the kinds of students who participated in this survey. The subjects do not represent all types of students (i.e., the more serious student), but overall it is suspected that they typify the average American college student.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In May of 1962 a survey was conducted of student attitudes toward the library and certain aspects of its use, and it was repeated in 1965 by Maurice B. Line assisted by Mavis Tidmarsh.[1] This study entitled, "Student Attitudes to the University Library: A Second Survey at Southampton University" was meant to check the progress of two issues raised in the first study which were: 1) students not making use of the library staff, and 2) making little use of reference materials. Although the objective of the study was to measure student attitudes toward the library in general, library use instruction was a subtopic.

The University began offering non-mandatory seminars to freshmen during the fall term. They were one hour presentations geared to a specific subject (i.e., French), or subject group (i.e., the Social Sciences) given to groups of eight to ten students at one time. Students received various duplicated aids such as lists of reference materials, etc.[2] In addition to the seminars, freshmen were given a tour of the library as well as a lecture with a

slide presentation.

The survey resulted in 15 percent of the students evaluating the seminars as very useful, 49 percent rating them fairly useful, and 36 percent rating them not very useful. A correlation was found between students' fields of study and the value of the seminars. Students of the social sciences tended to give the seminars a higher evaluation than students of the arts, law, science, or engineering.[3] D.S. Galsberg specifically addresses the research needs of sociology students in the article "The Library Scavenger Hunt: Teaching Library Skills in Introductory Sociology Courses."[4] It is ironic that in 1962, when students were asked whether or not they would attend library seminars if they were offered, 25 percent of non-scientific faculties and 30 percent of the scientific faculties responded that they would. This refutes the theory that the library needs of engineering students and science students are significantly fewer than those of students in other fields.[5]

In fact, in recent years attempts have been made to teach library skills to engineering students. D.S. Ingram and J.D. McCoy wrote "Engineering Students and the Library: Teaching the Technology of Library Research,"[6] and C.A. Erdmann wrote "Improving the Information Gathering Skills of Engineering Students."[7]

Concerning the poor evaluations of the seminars, several reasons were cited. The inexperience of library staff in teaching may have made the material confusing or uninteresting to the students, or the content may have been inappropriate. Perhaps the students had already been educated on certain topics, or they failed to learn how they could apply library skills in their own fields of interest. Lastly, the time of introduction of the seminars may not have been optimal, as fall term of the first year of college requires many academic as well as social adjustments.

There are a number of manuals and handbooks which aid librarians in planning bibliographic instruction programs. They cover everything from the ideal class size to how to explain the use of the card catalog, newspaper and other indexes, and services such as interlibrary loan. Carolyn Kirkendall's book Bibliographic Instruction and the Learning Process: Theory, Style, and Motivation[8] focuses on general teaching techniques, while Helen Wheeler's The Bibliographic Instruction Course Handbook[9] goes further into detail about **what** to teach and **how** to teach it.

Josephine Wedemeyer's survey, "Student Attitudes Toward Library Methods Courses in a University" was done as a result of the voiced dissatisfaction of the students. The study was a survey asking the following: class rank,

major/minor, value of the course, importance of each subject covered, time spent on assignments, and duplication of work in library and other courses.

Two courses were offered: Library Science 1 and 2. In May of 1952, questionnaires were distributed to 237 students enrolled in Library Science 2.

The students had four main complaints about the courses: 1) course assignments required too much time to prepare, 2) much of the material covered in the courses was already known, 3) there was duplication of topics being covered in other courses, and 4) students claimed to have no use for the material.[10] In response to the first complaint, the study did show that assignments were too time consuming and steps were taken to correct this. The results of the test actually contradicted the second complaint. Wedemeyer suggests that perhaps an initial screening of students might eliminate this problem. With respect to duplication, it seemed that the Library Science instructors and the English Department were not communicating effectively, and thereby overlapping in coverage, particularly in the area of bibliography and the dictionary. Finally, the responses to the survey negated the claim that there was little or no use for the material being taught.[11]

The Director appointed a committee of four Library

Science Instructors to work on five issues. First, library instruction was most ineffective for upperclassmen and graduate students; therefore, a program had to be designed with these particular groups in mind. Secondly, the courses were required for the College of Arts and Sciences only, so once again an effort to reach students in other subject areas was needed. Third, the problem of duplication was to be rectified by the English Department in cooperation with the Library Science instructors. Fourth, visual aids were to be utilized more frequently. And, finally, a study was to be done of students' problems of adjustment.[12]

Timothy D. Jewell conducted a survey, "Student Reactions to a Self-Paced Library Skills Workbook Program: Survey Evidence," at Bowling Green State University in 1978.[13] The purpose of the study was to measure the effectiveness of a workbook designed for library study. The book was compiled by BGSU librarians, and was to be used as an assignment in a required English composition course.

Two major factors contributing to student attitudes were discovered in the pilot study in the winter term of 1978-9. One factor is the academic rank of a student. Freshmen and Sophomores were more receptive, and appear to have gained more from the workbook, than the upperclassmen (according to the opinion of the upperclassmen). However,

the actual study shows that the upperclassmen took only "slightly less time to complete the assignment than the freshmen and sophomores, which would contradict their opinions of their own expertise."[14]

A student's class rank mainly influenced his/her personal opinion concerning the need for library instruction. Jewell points out that, "during the progression from freshmen to seniors, students develop "survival skills" of one kind or another based on such things as trial-and-error learning," and "peer tutoring"[15] which might account for this attitude. The agreement on the practicality of the assignment, again, declined as class rank increased: 59 percent among freshmen, 53 percent among sophomores, and 51 percent among juniors and seniors.[16]

Another factor affecting students' attitudes toward library use instruction is the perceived interest, enthusiasm, and support of the instructor.[17] A positive correlation was noted between responses to "perceived interest of the instructor," and other attitude statements.[18] In fact, "perceived interest" exerted a stronger influence on student attitudes than class rank.[19]

Other significant factors influencing students' attitudes are: 1) an inherent interest in the material, and 2) the applicability of the material. Students who are interested in library science are naturally more likely to

spend more time on assignments, and thus gain more from the course (or in this case, workbook) than students who do not have an initial interest. Along the same lines as "perceived interest" of the instructor is the instructor's ability to show students "how the information in the book could be used to locate materials for term papers." The idea being that if students can apply what they learn to other assignments, they might better understand the practicality and necessity of library use instruction.[20]

Richard A. Dreifuss' study, "Library Instruction and Graduate Students: More Work for George," focuses on whether or not faculty who teach graduate students share the beliefs of the faculty who teach undergraduate students concerning library use instruction. The study shows that there is an ever widening gap between the amount of library knowledge that is expected of a student by the time s/he reaches the graduate level, and the amount of library knowledge a typical graduate student actually possesses.

Graduate faculty assume that adequate library skills have been learned by the time a student reaches the graduate level, and if they have not been, it is the individual student's responsibility to learn them on his/her own.[21] A trend familiar to reference librarians is graduate students who are unfamiliar with major reference tools in their areas

of expertise, such as ERIC for education, and Psychological Abstracts for psychology.[22]

In this 1980 study, 203 students at the University of Missouri, Kansas City were asked to evaluate "two-hour library instruction classes" which were to acquaint them with a variety of basic library resources. Only 1 percent of the students claimed to already know all of the information presented, 13 percent claimed to already know most of it, and 80 percent claimed to already know some of it. The majority of the students (90%) pronounced the class, "extremely useful."[23] Interestingly, these graduate students would have to ask for library instruction if they felt they needed it. The students seemed more aware of their deficient library skills than their instructors.[24]

It is ironic that in Jewell's and Wedemeyer's studies the juniors and seniors claim to already know most, if not all, of the material presented in library use instruction while this one shows graduate students admitting their lack of library knowledge, and exhibiting receptiveness to library use instruction.

Constance A. Mellon conducted a qualitative study entitled "Library Anxiety: A Grounded Theory and Its Development" from which she developed a grounded theory of library anxiety due to students' lack of efficient library

skills.

For a period of two years, all students who took English composition were required to keep a journal of how they went about searching for information in the library, problems they encountered, and generally how they felt emotionally when in the library. At the conclusion of the semester, the students were required to write essays in which four questions were to be addressed: 1) What were your experiences using the library to find information for your paper? 2) How did you feel about the library and your ability to use it? 3) Did these feelings change over the course of the semester? and 4) How do you feel about using the library now?[25]

As a result of this study a grounded theory of library anxiety, similar to math and test anxiety, was developed.[26] Many students used terms such as, "scary," "overpowering," "lost," "helpless," "confused," and "fear of the unknown" when describing their library experiences.[27] Many of the comments made by students indicate that they had not received enough library instruction. Here are some of the things students wrote: "I know where the card catalogs were [sic], but there were so many little drawers, I wouldn't even know where to start"; "The library can be an overwhelming place to someone who doesn't understand how to use it"; "They never taught me how to use the library. I

guess they thought I would already know"; and "As soon as you enter the university, you are expected to know how to use the library."[28]

The size of the library was frequently cited as a cause of confusion and anxiety even though this study was conducted at "a southern university with 6,000 students"[29] with "a library of only 3 floors."[30]

In conclusion, one of the author's key findings was that "library anxiety was considerably reduced by interaction with a librarian in a fifty-minute orientation session."[31] The study raises some issues that could increase the impact of library instruction on students two of which are; 1) **when** a student should receive such instruction, and 2) **who** should do the instructing.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study differs from those in the literature review in depth of detail and breadth of population studied. Rather than find out the particular benefits and draw backs of a single library use instruction program, this is a survey of students from a variety of colleges and universities to discover, first, whether a library use course or program is offered at their schools and, second, if they think it is or would be a worthwhile venture. It is suspected that, today, students learn very little about the library in high school that can be applied in the higher academic setting with the onset of computerized card catalogs, CD-ROMs, online searching, and the diversity in subject of conventional print reference sources. This researcher surmises that students do not know how to use the library effectively, and are becoming more aware of their deficiencies in this area.

The questionnaire used in this study consists of fifteen items; two requesting demographic information,

and thirteen which measure current, general library use practices, available library use instruction, and attitudes toward it. Since the studies included in the literature review seem to reveal strong correlations between class rank and attitude toward library use instruction, this study further explores the relationship between field of study and library use instruction to discover what relationships exist (e.g., do students who are not aware of basic reference tools in their fields of study see the need for library education?)

The population for this study consists of a purposive sample of college and university students working at Cedar Point Amusement Park during the summer of 1990 who represent a variety of schools mainly throughout Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Indiana. The employees are housed in dormitories near the park, and questionnaires were distributed to the residents of three of the six housing units. This included approximately three hundred students. Boxes for collecting the responses were placed in the lobbies of the participating housing facilities, and two to three weeks were allotted for the completion and return of the questionnaires.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Demographic Profile of Subjects

The majority of the students who participated in the study are enrolled in medium-sized academic institutions with library collections between 100,000 and 999,999 volumes (see Table 1). Subjects' responses to the questionnaire item asking them to indicate their academic major are categorized into one of the following six broad categories: Education, Science & Technology, Health & Allied Health, Fine Arts, Business, and Arts and Sciences. Most of the respondents are majoring in the Arts & Sciences (see Table 2).

Students' Methods of Research

Item #3. Items #3 through #5 are designed to measure students' methods of research. A decided percentage (89.09%) of the 165 respondents know how to use the card catalog, and turn to it first when required to locate information. Many of the students interviewed do not understand that the online catalogs unique to each library

Table 1. Subjects by Type of Library

Collection Size	# of students	% of students
1,000,000 + volumes	63	39.62%
100,000-999,999 volumes	69	43.40%
0-99,999 volumes	27	16.98%
TOTAL	159	100%

Table 2. Subjects by Academic Major

Major	# of students	% of students
Education	19	12.34%
Science & Technology	26	16.88%
Fine Arts	18	11.69%
Business	30	19.48%
Health & Allied Health	23	14.94%
Arts & Sciences	38	24.68%
TOTAL	154	100%

(e.g., CATALYST at Kent State University) are simply card catalogs in data base form. As can be seen in Table 3, this is the most common method of gathering information.

Item #4. Of the 165 respondents, 81.82% claim to turn first to selected reference books when gathering information for a paper or class project. This method closely follows the card catalog for the most prevalent method of information gathering (see Table 3).

Item #5. The number of respondents who consult the librarian first when doing research is believed to be higher than the data indicate. The percentage of students who disagree that the librarian is the first source consulted is 63.03%. Nearly half that percentage (36.36%) claim the opposite (see Table 3).

Where Students Acquired Library Use Skills

Item #6. Items #6 through #8 are designed to determine where most students learned how to use the library. Table 4 ranks these methods according to mean score. Of the 163 respondents, 72.39% agree that they had learned to use the library in high school; 42.33% strongly agree (see Appendix C).

Item #7. Surprisingly, 51.52% of the 165 respondents disagree with the statement that library use had been taught in college freshman orientation. Table 5 illustrates how

Table 3. Methods of Library Research Ranked by Mean Score

Method	Mean
Card or Online catalog	3.22
Reference books	3.15
Librarian	2.35

Table 4. Where or How Students Acquired Library Skills Ranked by Mean Score

Where or How Learned	Mean
High School	3.06
On Own	2.59
Freshman Orientation	2.41

Table 5. Student Opinions about Whether Library Use Taught in Freshman Orientation

Size of Library/ Institution	Agree		Disagree		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1,000,000 + vols.	35	55.56%	28	44.44%	63	100%
100,000-999,999 vols.	29	42.03%	40	57.97%	69	100%
0-99,999 vols.	12	50%	12	50%	24	100%

students respond to this item according to the size of the library which they use. It is generally assumed that larger, more complex library systems offer more sophisticated library use instruction.

Item #8. The majority of the students surveyed, 58.64% of 162 respondents, claimed to have learned to use the library on their own.

Separate Library Use Courses

Item #9. The purpose of this question was to discover how many students have taken a course which focuses exclusively on the library and its use. Only 13.50% of the 163 responses indicate that a separate course on library use had been taken, but in reality the number is probably even lower. In conducting interviews it was found that some students considered introductory freshman courses, only one segment or unit of which was devoted to library instruction, as "separate" courses. Therefore, the data obtained from this item are inconclusive.

Item #10. The responses to whether a library use course is helpful present problems in valid interpretation as more students indicate the course is helpful than the number of students that indicate they took a course (see Appendix C).

Item #11. This item was designed to measure the need

for library instruction as perceived by students who had not taken courses in library use. The responses signify overall receptiveness to such instruction with more than half of the 165 respondents (55.15%) agreeing that a course in library use would be helpful.

Item #12. Items #12 through #14 measure students' reactions to three reasons for taking a library use course. Table 6 ranks them according to the mean score.
The respondents are split on the issue of taking a course in library use to improve their grade point averages: 40.24% agree that they would, while a slightly higher 43.90% disagree.

Table 6. Students' Reasons for Taking a Course in Library Use Ranked by Mean Score

Reason	Mean
To locate materials	2.75
To write better papers	2.50
To improve GPA	2.02

Item #13. Of the 164 respondents to this item, 59.14% agree that library instruction would enhance their abilities to write quality papers. It is found that of the six categories of majors, students majoring in Education and Business are more inclined to take a library use course to

help them write better papers (73.33% and 67.86%, respectively). In only one group, Health & Allied Health, the percentage of students who do not think library use instruction would help them write papers (50%) is higher than the percentage of those who do (46.15%), but not by much. What is somewhat surprising is that 63.64% of Fine Arts majors surveyed agree with this statement since the Fine Arts are generally not perceived as subjects that are researched for the sake of writing papers.

Item #14. According to the respondents, the primary reason for taking a course in library use is to learn to locate materials. Of the 164 respondents, 72.12% agree with this statement, while only 19.39% disagree.

Item #15. Of the 164 respondents to this item, 72.56% indicate that they would benefit from a library use course. A couple of the students wrote comments in the margins. One student who strongly disagrees that such a course would not be helpful wrote, "if I had not taken one [a course], or I did not know how to use a library, it would be helpful." Another student who added a response under "not applicable" wrote, "depends on instructor."

In each of the six categories of academic majors, the majority of respondents disagree that a course in library use instruction would **not** be helpful. An overwhelming 100% of Education majors who responded to this item think a

course in library instruction would be helpful. Of the Business majors 89.29% and, again, a high percentage of Fine Arts majors (77.27%), also perceive a need for library use instruction.

Table 7 shows the overall collapsed data for questionnaire items #3 through #15.

Table 7. Collapsed Data for Questionnaire Items 3-15

Item		Agree		Disagree		Not Applicable	
	N	#	%	#	%	#	%
Card catalog	165	147	89.09%	16	9.70%	2	1.21%
Reference books	165	135	81.82%	30	18.18%	-	-
Librarian	165	60	36.36%	104	63.03%	1	.61%
High school	163	118	72.39%	45	27.61%	-	-
Freshman orientation	165	76	46.06%	85	51.52%	4	2.42%
On own	162	95	58.64%	64	39.51%	3	1.85%
Taken course	163	22	13.50%	131	80.37%	10	6.13%
Found helpful	161	27	16.77%	21	13.04%	113	70.19%
Would be helpful	165	91	55.15%	37	22.42%	37	22.42%
Improve GPA	164	66	40.24%	72	43.90%	26	15.85%
Better papers	164	97	59.15%	54	32.93%	13	7.93%
Locate materials	165	119	72.12%	32	19.39%	14	8.48%
Not helpful	164	41	25%	119	72.56%	4	2.44%

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Successful bibliographic instruction is not easy to plan, and there are many students who are unaffected by programs or courses for one reason or another. This study indicates that one reason is apathy; students feel library use instruction is impractical and/or unnecessary. However, the results of this study also show that, overall, students feel this type of instruction is a good idea, but apparently for students other than themselves.

Many of the students surveyed (58.64%) taught themselves to use the library, but what is not known is <u>how well</u> each student taught him/herself. A student who knows how to use the card catalog considers him/herself a library expert. With the automation of many resources students are <u>not</u> as aware of their own inadequate library skills as was previously thought.

While self-teaching is the second most popular means of acquiring library skills, high school instruction is number one. In response to this, one might wonder how much

of this instruction the student actually remembers, how much of what had been learned is now irrelevant, and how much new technology has since become a fundamental element of doing research in a library. By contrast, a very low percentage (36.36%) of the subjects admit to consulting the librarian before any other source. It is suspected that in reality this percentage is higher. Some students may be ashamed or embarrassed to tell the truth about this even on an anonymous questionnaire.

The least popular way of learning library use skills is college freshmen orientation. In conducting the face-to-face interviews it is discovered that students are interpreting "freshman orientation" in different ways. This misinterpretation also caused problems with questionnaire item #9 which was to determine if a "separate course" in library use had been taken.

At Ohio State University all freshmen are required to take a course called University College to orient students to all aspects of the university including the library. Some of the students surveyed consider this a "separate course" while others classify it as freshmen orientation. For the sake of this survey University College should have been considered freshmen orientation, so the percentage of students who learn to use the library in freshmen orientation should have been higher. In any case, the

majority of students are relying on the library skills they learned in high school to carry them through college, and they see nothing wrong with that.

Contrary to students' apathy toward library use instruction, they are overwhelmingly in favor of it. A discrepancy between items #9 (had a separate course been taken), and #10 (was the course helpful?) shows that the number of students who think the course is helpful is higher than those who actually took a course. This may be partially explained by the different interpretations of a "separate course" mentioned in the previous paragraph, but it is also possible that some students who did not take a course, but indicate that it is helpful mean they think a course would be helpful.

The responses to questionnaire item #15 support the supposition that students do see the value of library use instruction, and are aware that there are certain skills required to do research in an academic library no matter how large or small. However, this survey shows that students are very often not aware of their own deficiencies in library use skills. They think a library use course is valuable--for **other** students.

Recommendation for Future Research

Now that it has been established that most students do

not think bibliographic instruction is a total waste of time, students' must be made aware of the fact that they are not as proficient in using the library as they think they are.

This might be accomplished by two separate studies performed on the same group of students. The first study should attempt to ascertain, specifically, what each student knows about library resources. The methodology should be similar to that used by Constance Mellon in her development of a grounded theory of library anxiety.[32] Students should be given the liberty to express their knowledge, or lack thereof, in their own terminology; they should not be led or prompted.

Then, in a second study, a questionnaire similar to the one used in this study should be distributed. The objective should be to determine the attitudes of students toward library use instruction. Questions should focus specifically on the value of bibliographic instruction; whether or not a student thinks it is worthwhile, particularly for him/herself.

An interesting viewpoint for this study would be that of first-term graduate students who probably struggled through four years of college relying on the "peer tutoring" and other library survival tactics that Richard Dreifuss mentions in his article "Library Instruction and Graduate

Students,"[33] and is presently, perhaps for the first time, faced with the prospect of doing serious research in a library. Planners of bibliographic instruction courses or programs are most likely already mindful of the fact that students get very bored with repetition. A student who gets the same lecture, beginning with how to use the card catalog, in two separate courses is liable to tune out the entire lecture, and miss something which s/he did not already know.

It is obvious from this study that most students know how to use the card catalog, as it is the first place they go when searching for information on a specific topic. Therefore, bibliographic instructors should make the use of CD-ROMs and unique subject indexes and abstracts the focal point of their sessions. The card catalog should certainly not be ignored, particularly now that most "card catalogs" are in database form and do not even consist of cards anymore, but emphasis should be placed on topics which are most likely to be new and unknown to college students.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION

1. What school do you attend? _____

2. What is your major? _____

Please check one response for each question. SA=strongly agree, A=agree, D=disagree, SD=strongly disagree, and NA=not applicable.

	SA	A	D	SD	NA
3. When gathering information for a paper or a project, I first consult the card catalog or online catalog.	—	—	—	—	
4. When gathering information for a paper or a project, I first consult reference books such as, encyclopedias, indexes, etc.	—	—	—	—	
5. When gathering information for a paper or a project, I first consult the librarian.	—	—	—	—	
6. I learned to use the library in high school.	—	—	—	—	
7. I learned to use the library as a part of freshman orientation in college.	—	—	—	—	
8. I learned to use the library on my own.	—	—	—	—	
9. I have taken a separate course in using the library.	—	—	—	—	
10. I found the course helpful.	—	—	—	—	—
11. I have not taken a course in using the library, but I feel that one would be helpful.	—	—	—	—	—
12. I would take such a course because it would be easy and I could improve my grade point average.	—	—	—	—	—
13. I would take such a course because it would help me to write better papers.	—	—	—	—	—
14. I would take such a course because	—	—	—	—	—
15. I do not think such a course would be helpful.	—	—	—	—	

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What school do you attend? _____

2. What is your major? _____

3. Have you ever taken a separate course in using the library?

   Yes ____ No ____

4. If yes, what kinds of things did you learn? _____

   _____

5. If no, what kinds of things do you suppose are taught in such a course?

   _____

   _____

   Do you think such a course would be worthwhile?

   Yes ____ No ____

   Why or why not? _____

6. Can you name the primary index to periodical literature in your field?

   _____

7. Have you ever consulted one of these or other indexes on a CD-ROM?

   Yes ____ No ____

   If yes, which one(s)? _____

   _____

APPENDIX C

TALLY SHEET SHOWING NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS FOR EACH ITEM

1. What school do you attend? _____

2. What is your major? _____

Please check one response for each question. SA=strongly agree, A=agree, D=disagree, SD=strongly disagree, and NA=not applicable.

	SA	A	D	SD	NA
3. When gathering information for a paper or a project, I first consult the card catalog or online catalog.	62	85	13	3	2
4. When gathering information for a paper or a project, I first consult reference books such as, encyclopedias, indexes, etc.	56	79	28	2	
5. When gathering information for a paper or a project, I first consult the librarian.	21	39	82	22	1
6. I learned to use the library in high school.	69	49	31	14	
7. I learned to use the library as a part of freshman orientation in college.	36	40	49	36	
8. I learned to use the library on my own.	26	69	45	19	3
9. I have taken a separate course in using the library.	12	10	66	65	10
10. I found the course helpful.	10	17	12	9	113
11. I have not taken a course in using the library, but I feel that one would be helpful.	24	67	23	14	37
12. I would take such a course because it would be easy and I could improve my grade point average.	22	44	40	32	26
13. I would take such a course because it would help me to write better papers.	36	61	29	25	13
14. I would take such a course because	44	75	20	12	14
15. I do not think such a course would be helpful.	17	24	62	57	4

NOTES

[1] Maurice B. Line and Mavis Tidmarsh, "Student Attitudes to the University Library: A Second Survey at Southampton University," Journal of Documentation 22 (June 1966): 129.

[2] Ibid., 124.

[3] Ibid., 129.

[4] D.S. Galsberg and others, "The Library Scavenger Hunt: Teaching Library Skills in Introductory Sociology Courses," Teaching Sociology 18 (April 1990).

[5] Maurice B. Line and Mavis Tidmarsh, "Student Attitudes to the University Library," Journal of Documentation, 129.

[6] D.S. Ingram and J.D. McCoy, "Engineering Students and the Library: Teaching the Technology of Library Research," Engineering Education 80 (May/June 1990).

[7] C.A. Erdmann, "Improving the Information Gathering Skills of Engineering Students," Engineering Education 80 (May/June 1990).

[8] Carolyn A. Kirkendall, Bibliographic Instruction and the Learning Process: Theory, Style, and Motivation, Library Orientation Series (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Pierian, 1984).

[9] Helen R. Wheeler, The Bibliographic Instruction-Course Handbook: a Skills and Concepts Approach to the Undergraduate, Research Methodology, Credit Course: for College and University Personnel, (Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow, 1988).

[10] Josephine A. Wedemeyer, "Student Attitudes Toward Library Methods Courses in a University," College and Research Libraries 15 (July 1954): 285.

[11] Ibid., 289.

[12] Ibid., 289.

[13] Timothy D. Jewell, "Student Reactions to a Self-Paced Library Skills Workbook Program: Survey Evidence," College and Research Libraries 43 (Summer 1982): 372-3

[14] Ibid., 376.

[15] Ibid., 372.

[16] Ibid., 376.

[17] Ibid., 376.

[18] Ibid., 376-7.

[19] Ibid., 376.

[20] Ibid., 376.

[21] Richard A. Dreifuss, "Library Instruction and Graduate Students: More Work for George," RQ (Winter 1981): 122.

[22] Ibid., 122.

[23] Ibid., 123.

[24] Ibid., 123.

[25] Constance A. Mellon, "Library Anxiety: A Grounded Theory and Its Development," College and Research Libraries 47 (March 1986): 160.

[26] Ibid., 162.

[27] Ibid., 163.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid., 160.

[31] Ibid., 164.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dreifuss, Richard A. "Library Instruction and Graduate Students: More Work for George." RQ (Winter 1981): 121-3.

Erdmann, C.A. "Improving the Information Gathering Skills of Engineering Students." Engineering Education (May/June 1990): 80: 456-60.

Galsberg, D.S. and others. "The Library Scavenger Hunt: Teaching Library Skills in Introductory Sociology Courses." Teaching Sociology (April 1990): 18:231-4.

Ingram, D.S. and J.D. McCoy. "Engineering Students and the Library: Teaching the Technology of Library Research." Engineering Education (May/June 1990): 80:461-2.

Jewell, Timothy D. "Student Reactions to a Self-Paced Library Skills Workbook Program: Survey Evidence." College and Research Libraries 43 (Summer 1982): 371-378.

Kirkendall, Carolyn A. Bibliographic Instruction and the Learning Process: Theory, Style, and Motivation. Library Orientation Series. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Pierian, 1984.

Line, Maurice B., and Mavis Tidmarsh. "Student Attitudes to the University Library: A Second Survey at Southampton University." Journal of Documentation 22 (June 1966): 123-35.

Mellon, Constance A. "Library Anxiety: A Grounded Theory and Its Development." College and Research Libraries 47 (March 1986): 160-5.

Wedemeyer, Josephine A. "Student Attitudes Toward Library Methods Courses in a University." College and Research Libraries 15 (July 1954): 285-9.

Wheeler, Helen R. The Bibliographic Instruction-Course Handbook: a Skills and Concepts Approach to the Undergraduate, Research Methodology, Credit Course: for College and University Personnel. Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow, 1988.